



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of:

Albertsson et al.

: Attorney Docket: 43315-214365

Application No.: 09/902,536

: Art Unit: 3682

Filed: July 11, 2001

: Examiner: C. Hansen

Title: MANIPULATOR

8/9/05

RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Supplemental Examiner's Answer issued December 29, 2004.

The present invention as recited in independent claim 11 differs structurally from the device suggested by Suzuki et al. For example, Suzuki et al. includes an arm 13 that does not rotate. On the other hand, the present invention as recited in claim 11 includes an upper arm that includes a front arm part and a rear arm part, wherein the front arm part is rotatable about a longitudinal axis.

Suzuki et al. is not properly combinable with Mauletti as suggested by the Examiner. For example, Suzuki et al. suggests a one piece arm 13 that does not rotate. As shown in the drawings and described in the specification, Suzuki et al. suggests a robot with five degrees of